

Appl. No. 10/800310
Reply to Action dated 12/16/2005
Page 5

REMARKS

Reconsideration and reexamination of the application are requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claim 1 is amended. Claims 1-5 are pending.

I. Amendments

The amendment to the title is supported by the original disclosure, for example page 2, lines 16-18.

The amendments to claim 1 are supported by the original disclosure, for example page 3, lines 20-22 and the drawings.

No new matter has been added.

II. Specification objection

The title is objected to for not being descriptive. The title has been amended to be more descriptive. Withdrawal of the objection is requested.

III. Prior art rejections

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Mehney et al. (US 6,039,344).

Mehny does not disclose an occupant weight detection system with seat rails, a plurality of weight detection means, and a linking member, where the plurality of weight detection means are disposed below the seat rails and the linking member, as recited in claim 1. When a vehicle seat moves and slides on the first and second seat rails, the seat may be displaced from its proper position on the rails which may apply a twisting force to the rails. Such twisting force can be received and supported by the linking member, so that the weight detection means which are disposed below the rails and linking member can carry out weight detection with increased accuracy.

Mehny discloses a system with a seat 12, seat rails 50 and weight sensors 22. In Mehny, the sensors 22 are disposed above the seat rails 50, connected between the top of the seat rails 50 and the seat 12. Therefore, Mehny does not anticipate claim 1.

Appl. No. 10/800310
Reply to Action dated 12/16/2005
Page 6

Nor does Mehny suggest arranging the sensors 22 so that they are below the seat rails 50 and element 14 characterized in the rejection as the linking member, nor the advantages that arise from such an arrangement.

For at least these reasons, claim 1 is patentable over Mehny. Claims 2-5 depend upon claim 1 and are patentable along with claim 1 and need not be separately distinguished. Applicants do not concede the propriety of the rejection to claims 2-5.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above, early issuance of a notice of allowance is solicited. Any questions regarding this communication can be directed to the undersigned attorney, Curtis B. Hamre, Reg. No. 29,165 at (612) 455-3802.



Dated: March 15, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER &
LARSON, P.C.
P.O. Box 2902-0902
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0902
(612) 455-3800

By: Curtis B. Hamre

Curtis B. Hamre
Reg. No. 29,165
CBH/jal